



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,075	04/14/2004	Mary E. Gerritsen	P2014R1	7011
9157 7590 12/19/2006 GENENTECH, INC. 1 DNA WAY SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080			EXAMINER LI, RUIXIANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
31 DAYS	12/19/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/824,075	Applicant(s) GERRITSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Ruixiang Li	Art Unit 1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-12, 26, and 27, drawn to a method of modulating angiogenesis comprising administering to a cell or a mammal an effective amount of STC or variant thereof, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
- II. Claims 13-20, drawn to a method of selectively inhibiting an angiogenic process promoted by a first angiogenic factor and but not the angiogenesis process promoted by a second angiogenic factor, comprising administering to a cell exposed to both factors an effective amount of STC-1 or a variant thereof, wherein the STC-1 or a variant thereof inhibits at least one step of the angiogenic process promoted by the first angiogenic factor but not the second angiogenic factor, classified in class 514, subclass 12.
- III. Claims 21-25, drawn to a polypeptide comprising an amino acid sequence of at least 80% identity to the sequence of human STC-1, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- IV. Claims 28 and 29, drawn to a method of promoting vascular ization in a mammal, comprising administering to the mammal an effective amount of an antagonist of STC-1 or a variant thereof, classification depend upon the structure of the antagonist.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other for the following reasons. Inventions I, II, and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation,

Art Unit: 1646

different functions, or different effects (MPEP §806.04, MPEP §808.01). In the instant case, In the instant case, the different inventions are drawn to completely different methods each having completely different method steps, using different compositions, or having different biological outcomes. Invention I requires modulating angiogenesis comprising administering to a cell or a mammal an effective amount of STC or variant thereof; Invention II requires selectively inhibiting an angiogenic process promoted by a first angiogenic factor and but not the angiogenesis process promoted by a second angiogenic factor; whereas Invention IV requires promoting vascularization in a mammal, comprising administering to the mammal an effective amount of an antagonist of STC-1 or a variant thereof. Each method is unique and not required one for another. Thus, the methods are exclusive and require non-cohesive searches and considerations.

3. Invention III is related to Inventions I and II as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). For example, the polypeptides may be used in a materially different process such as to immunize mice to produce an antibody.
4. Invention III is an independent invention from Invention IV. The different inventions are drawn to distinct product and method inventions.

Art Unit: 1646

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for a single group is not required for any other group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

Art Unit: 1646

commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

8. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: (i). cells cultured in vitro and cells present in vivo, as listed in claims 2 and 4; (ii). species of antagonists: an antibody, a small molecule, and a peptide, as listed in claims 10-12. The species are completely different, not interchangeable, and require non-cohesive searches and considerations.

Should Applicants elect an invention group comprising these claims, Applicant is further required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic with respect to the species of cells; claim 9 is generic with respect to the species of antagonists.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a

Art Unit: 1646

listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48 (b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48 (b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17 (I).

Art Unit: 1646

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruixiang Li whose telephone number is (571) 272-0875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol, can be reached on (571) 272-0835. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at the toll-free phone number 866-217-9197.

Ruixiang Li

Ruixiang Li, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
December 12, 2006

RUIXIANG LI, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER